

generating a first signal indicative of a status of a person or said person's environment;

detecting an event requiring the attention of a remote supervisor;

transmitting at least a portion of said first signal to said remote supervisor responsively to a result of said step of detecting;

wherein said step of detecting includes detecting behavior of a person other than said child and in said child's environment.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,576,972 to Harrison (hereinafter "Harrison"). Additionally, the Examiner rejects claims 10-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,062,216 to Corn (hereinafter "Corn"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Corn. Lastly, the Examiner rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corn in view of Harrison.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections with respect to claims 1-12 and 17 for at least the reasons set forth below. With respect to claims 13-16 and 18-19, independent claim 13 has been amended to include the features of claim 17.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner argues that Harrison discloses all of the features of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Harrison merely discloses rendering a 3-D representation of the monitored area and displaying such to a user (see column 10, lines 29-44). Therefore, Harrison does not disclose or suggest "said alarm

signal including at least a portion of said monitor signal at least one of immediately prior to or immediately after an incidence of said alarm condition" as is recited in independent claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 10, the Examiner argues that Corn discloses all of the features of claim 10. Applicants again respectfully disagree and submit that Corn makes no mention or suggestion of "generating first and second signals responsive to a first state of a caretaker of said person and a second state of said person" as is recited in claim 10.

With respect to independent claim 13, the same has been amended to include the features of dependent claim 17. The Examiner argues that the features of claim 17 are shown in Corn. Applicants respectfully disagree. Dependent claim 17 recites "said step of detecting includes detecting behavior of a person other than said child and in said child's environment." Applicants respectfully submit that neither Corn nor Harrison discloses or suggests such a feature.

With regard to the rejections of claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), monitoring systems, devices and methods having the features discussed above and as claimed in independent claims 1, 10, and 13 (as amended) are nowhere disclosed in Harrison or Corn. Since it has been decided that "anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference, disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim,"¹ independent claims 1, 10, and 13 (as amended) are not anticipated by either Harrison or Corn. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10, and 13 (as amended) patentably distinguish over both Harrison and Corn and are allowable. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, and 19 being dependent upon claims 1, 10, and 13, are thus allowable therewith,

¹ Lindeman Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458; 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir., 1984).


claim 17 being canceled. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to claims 7 and 18, since independent claims 1 and 13 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable, claims 7 and 18 are allowable therewith because they depend from an allowable base claim. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 7 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the application by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."**

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Spinelli

Registration No. 39,533

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

TS/cm

Enclosure (Version with Markings to Show Changes Made)



09/808,848

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 17 has been canceled and claim 13 has been amended as follows:

13. (Amended) A method of monitoring a person requiring supervision,
comprising the steps of:

generating a first signal indicative of a status of a person or said person's
environment;

detecting an event requiring the attention of a remote supervisor;

transmitting at least a portion of said first signal to said remote supervisor
responsively to a result of said step of detecting[.];

wherein said step of detecting includes detecting behavior of a person other
than said child and in said child's environment.